



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/995,087

11/27/2001

Paul Michael Dantzig

YOR920010320US1

9571

7590

09/20/2006

Gail H. Zarick  
Intellectual Property Law Dept.  
IBM Corporation  
P.O. Box 218  
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

EXAMINER

NAWAZ, ASAD M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/995,087

Applicant(s)

DANTZIG ET AL.

Examiner

Asad M. Nawaz

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the RCE received 7/5/06. Claims 1, 4, 10-11, 14-15, 20-23, 26-27, 31-32, 35-36, and 40-42 were amended. No other claims have been amended, added, or canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-42 are pending.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 4-5, 10-11, 14-15, 17, 20-23, 26-28, 31-32, 35-36, and 40-42 are rejected for being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nepustil USPAT: 6,240,454).

As to claim 1, Nepustil teaches a method in a network comprising a primary server and a plurality of offload servers, for dynamic offloading of processing requests from said primary server to any one of said plurality of offload servers, the method comprising the steps of:

determining a load on said primary server, if the load on said primary server is less than a first threshold, serving processing requests at said primary server (figs 4 and 5, col 2, lines 2-4 and 50-56; col 5, lines 14-25)

and only if the load on said primary server exceeds said first threshold, then offloading at least a portion of said processing requests to any one of said plurality of offload servers (col 1, lines 60-67; col 2, lines 56-63; col 5, lines 14-25)

Claims 11, 21-23, 32, 41, and 42 are essentially the method, program product, and system for the claim above. They further contain similar limitations as the claim above and thus are rejected under similar rationale

As to claim 4, Nepustil teaches the method of claim 1 wherein serving the processing requests at said primary server includes returning a page to a user wherein all the embedded objects in the page have links to said primary server; and offloading at least a portion of the processing request to any one of said servers includes serving a base page at said primary server in which the links for embedded objects point to any one of said plurality of servers. (col 2, lines 47-67)

Claims 14, 26, and 35 are essentially the method, program product, and system for the claim above. They further contain similar limitations as the claim above and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 5, Nepustil teaches the method of claim 1 wherein offloading at least a portion of the processing requests to said at least one offload server includes routing an incoming Web request to a selected offload server. (col 2, lines 47-67; col 5, lines 14-25)

Claims 15, 27, and 36 are essentially the method, program product, and system for the claim above. They further contain similar limitations as the claim above and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 10, Nepustil teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the determination of which of said at least one offload server that at least one processing request is to be offloaded to is based on one or more of a group including a client identity, a client gateway (IP) address, a

Art Unit: 2155

price of the offload service, or a current or previous load on the at least one offload server. (col 2, lines 20-46)

Claims 17, 20, 28, 31, and 40 are essentially the method, program product, and system for the claim above. They further contain similar limitations as the claim above and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2-3, 6-7, 12-13, 16, 24-25, 29, 33-34, and 37-39 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nepustil further in view of Swildens et al (USPAT: 6,694,358)..

As to claim 2, Nepustil teaches the method of claim 1 however does not explicitly indicate wherein said load comprises bandwidth utilization and said first threshold is a network bandwidth utilization of said primary server.

Swildens et al teach the method wherein said load comprises bandwidth utilization and said first threshold is a network bandwidth utilization of said primary server. (Col 4, lines 1-4; col 5, lines 1-6 and 34-40; col 8, lines 18-48)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Swildens into those of Nepustil to make the system more efficient. Basing the offloading of work to a secondary server on numerous criteria allows the system to work in an optimal state.

Claims 12, 24 and 33 are essentially the method, program product, and system for the claim above. They further contain similar limitations as the claim above and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 3, Nepustil teaches the method of claim 1 however does not explicitly indicate wherein the said load comprises CPU utilization and said first threshold is a CPU utilization of said primary server. Swildens teaches the method wherein the said load comprises CPU utilization and said first threshold is a CPU utilization of said primary server. (col 5, lines 10-15; col 8, lines 18-48)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Swildens into those of Nepustil to make the system more efficient. Basing the offloading of work to a secondary server on numerous criteria allows the system to work in an optimal state.

Claims 13, 25, and 34 are essentially the method, program product, and system for the claim above. They further contain similar limitations as the claim above and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 6, Nepustil teaches the method of claim 1 but does not explicitly indicate throttling the request based upon another threshold. Swildens teaches the method including the

step of, if the processing load on said primary server exceeds a second threshold, throttling at least one processing request. (col 9, lines 25-30; col 12, lines 3-36)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Swildens into those of Nepustil to make the system more efficient. By throttling and dropping requests when a load is too burdensome to even offload to a secondary server, the system can increase efficiency by offload the burden to the requesting clients by simple indicating the server is busy and to try again.

Claims 16 and 37 are essentially the method, program product, and system for the claim above. They further contain similar limitations as the claim above and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 7, Nepustil teaches the method of claim 6 however does not explicitly indicate throttling a request based upon a second threshold. Swildens teaches the method wherein throttling at least one processing request includes returning a page to a user indicating that a server is overloaded. (col 9, lines 25-30; col 12, lines 3-36)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Swildens into those of Nepustil to make the system more efficient. By throttling and dropping requests when a load is too burdensome to even offload to a secondary server, the system can increase efficiency by offload the burden to the requesting clients by simple indicating the server is busy and to try again.

Claims 29, and 38-39 are essentially the method, program product, and system for the claim above. They further contain similar limitations as the claim above and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

6. Claims 8-9, 18-19, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nepustil and Swildens further in view of Gupta et al (US Patent No 6,374,305).

As to claim 8, Nepustil and Swildens teach the method of claim 6 but does not explicitly indicate dropping at least one processing request without returning any information to a user.

Gupta et al teaches requests being dropped if they reach a certain threshold without returning any additional information.(col 3, lines 9-20)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Gupta into those of Nepustil and Swildens to make the system more efficient. By dropping requests that exceed previously set thresholds, the system no longer wastes server/processing time or other network resources in sending a message.

Claims 18 and 30 are essentially the method, program product, and system for the claim above. They further contain similar limitations as the claim above and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 9, Nepustil and Swildens teaches the method of claim 6 wherein throttling at least one processing request includes returning a page to a user indicating that a server is overloaded if said load exceeds said second threshold but does not explicitly indicate dropping said at least one processing request if said load exceeds a threshold.

Gupta et al teaches requests being dropped if they reach a certain threshold without returning any additional information.(col 3, lines 9-20)



It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Gupta into those of Nepustil and Swildens to make the system more efficient. By dropping requests that exceed previously set thresholds, the system no longer wastes server/processing time or other network resources in sending a message.

Claim 19 is essentially the method, program product, and system for the claim above. They further contain similar limitations as the claim above and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In substance the applicant argues that Nepustil teaches that processing requests are directed to specific assignments while any the instant application teaches that all servers are available for processing requests.

In response to applicant's arguments, the claim language states that requests may be offloaded to *any one* of the offload servers. It should be noted that in fact the servers of specified assignments fit into the definition of any one of offload servers. If, however, the applicant meant that all available offload servers are capable of receiving the request, then the claim language should have stated limitations to that extent. Therefore, Nepustil still meets the scope of the invention as currently claimed.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Asad M. Nawaz whose telephone number is (571) 272-3988. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*AMN*

AMN

*Philip Tran*  
PRIMARY EXAMINER